UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,687	05/04/2006	Thomas Karlsson	PS02 0290US2	4742
58561 7590 01/11/2010 HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP			EXAMINER	
11350 RANDO	M HILLS ROAD	SHAFI, MUHAMMAD		
SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA	22030		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/595,687	KARLSSON, THOMAS				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MUHAMMAD SHAFI	3663				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Pasponsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Se	entember 2000					
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 September 2009</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  2b) This action is non-final.					
<i>,</i>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pane Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 455 C.G. 215.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,8-16 and 20-24</u> is/are pending ir	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,8-16 and 20-24</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,8-16 and 20-24</u> are subject to re	striction and/or election requirem	ent.				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te				

Art Unit: 3663

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Upon review of applicant's newly presented claims it noted that a restriction/election is warranted. Any inconvenience to applicant is regretted.

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1, 4-5 are drawn to a method of capturing by a user device electronic media, classified in class 701, subclass 200.
  - II. Claims 8-12 are drawn to a Portable electronic device for organizing data points of geographic location, classified in class 707, and subclass 100.
  - III Claims 13-14 are drawn to a system for receiving and providing map data, classified in class 340, subclass 539.2.
  - IV. Claims 15-16 and 23-24 are drawn to a computer program code (i.e.Product), classified in class 713, subclass 190.
  - V. Claims 20-22 are drawn to a method for organizing data of geographic location, classified in class 340, and subclass 995.14

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Invention I/V/IV and II/III are related as process and apparatus. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed

Art Unit: 3663

can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the process as claimed (i.e. invention I/V/IV) can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as it can be utilized by any on-board or off-board navigation system.

- 3. Inventions I/V and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the process for using the products as claimed (i.e. invention I/V) can be practiced with another materially different product such as it can be utilized by navigation system such as TOM TOM or GARMIN GPS system.
- 4. Inventions I and V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination V has separate utility such as organizing data in relation to fix points of geographical locations. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

5. Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination IIII has separate utility such as having a Portable electronic device i.e. Mobile Phone for organizing data points of geographic locations. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

6. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

Art Unit: 3663

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUHAMMAD SHAFI whose telephone number is (571)270-5741. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM -5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on (571)-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ms/ Examiner Art Unit 3663

/Jack W. Keith/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663